

ll. S.

MS. A. 2. 4. - A. 1

REPORT

OF THE

National Divorce Reform League

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31,

1890.

CHILDREN'S

SOCIETY

THE National Divorcee Reform League.

PRESIDENT:

The Rt. Rev. BENJAMIN H. PADDOCK, D. D., Boston.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

Rev. ALVAH HOVEY, D. D., LL. D., Newton Centre, Mass.
Hon. NATHANIEL SHIPMAN, LL. D., Hartford, Conn.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY:

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL. D., Auburndale, Mass.

RECORDING SECRETARY:

Rev. C. H. SPALDING, 14 Tremont Temple, Boston.

TREASURER:

WILLIAM G. BENEDET, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Hon. EDMUND H. BENNETT, LL. D., Boston.
Pres. M. H. BUCKHAM, D. D., Burlington, Vt.
GEORGE C. SHATTUCK, M. D., Boston.
Hon. SIMEON E. BALDWIN, New Haven, Conn.
Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D. D., Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph. D., Newton Centre, Mass.
Prof. GEORGE HARRIS, D. D., Andover, Mass.
Hon. THEODORE W. DWIGHT, LL. D., New York.
Rev. JAMES DE NORMANDIE, Roxbury, Mass.
Pres. G. D. B. PEPPER, D. D., Waterville, Me.
Hon. HAMILTON ANDREWS HILL, Boston.
Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL. D., Auburndale, Mass.

131008 016

REPORT

OF THE

National Divorce Reform League,

FOR THE

YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1890.

BOSTON:

PRINTED BY C. H. SIMONDS & CO.,

47 FRANKLIN STREET.

CONTENTS.

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| OFFICERS, | See cover, Page 2 |
| CONSTITUTION AND FORM OF BEQUEST, | See cover, " 3 |
| INTRODUCTORY NOTES, | " 3 |
| MINUTES OF ANNUAL MEETING, | " 5 |
| REPORT OF CORRESPONDING SECRETARY, | " 6 |
| REPORT OF TREASURER, | " 20 |
| CONTRIBUTIONS, | " 20 |

INTRODUCTORY NOTES.

1. OUR Reports for the years 1886 to 1890, except that for 1889, may be obtained on application to the Corresponding Secretary at AUBURNDALE, MASS. The supply of the Report for 1889 is now exhausted. A reprint of the fundamental table of the official report, showing the divorces of the States and Territories for each of the years 1867 to 1886, with other summaries, can be had on application. A few copies only of several of the former special issues of the League can now be supplied.

2. The Report of the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe (pp. 1,074), can soon be had on application to the Commissioner at Washington, or to Members of Congress. The first edition is now out of print. But a second and larger edition will probably be ready in a few weeks.

3. The Report of the League for 1890 is largely devoted to the present movement for *Uniform Laws* and to *Education*. Attention is called to the discussion of the need in the latter department, and especially to the remarks on the usefulness of a special fund. The form of a bequest is printed on the third page of the cover. But it is hoped that some large gifts may also be made by living donors for a permanent fund.

4. We gratefully acknowledge the generous contributions of our old friends, most of which have been continued from year to year, and earnestly invite their renewal. *Money sent without personal solicitation, and as early in the year as possible, is particularly welcome and useful.*

5. Every friend of the Family and the Home is respectfully asked to give this most fundamental and influential of social institutions its proper place in his annual charities beside that of the church, the school, and other social institutions. The League is the only society of the kind in the country, and is devoted to a broad and inclusive work in behalf of the American Home, and needs resources commensurate with the importance of its objects and work.

6. Special attention is called to the privilege of **ASSOCIATE ANNUAL MEMBERSHIP**, which is fully extended to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of *five dollars* for the year, to be renewed at the pleasure of the subscriber. Such members are for the time members in full, entitled to vote at our meetings and receive all our publications. *If you are not a larger contributor, will you not send your request for associate membership and the fee to the Treasurer at once, and thus give substantial aid to this most important work?*

7. The Treasurer, **WILLIAM G. BENEDICT**, 610 ATLANTIC AVENUE, BOSTON, MASS., will gratefully acknowledge all contributions.

8. All correspondence relating to the general work of the League and special inquiries for lectures, literature and information should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary. **REV. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., AUBURNDALE, MASS.**

Contributions may be sent to him, or to the Treasurer as directed above.

The following was read by Mr. Dike on introducing his Report:

Before taking up the formal Report of the year, some reference may properly be made to the death of the Hon. Edward I. Thomas, of Brookline, a member of our Executive Committee, which occurred Dec. 26, 1890. Mr. Thomas was an interested and active member of the League for several years, and last year kindly consented to an election to the Executive Committee. His admirable qualities of mind, his large experience in public affairs and in business and philanthropic work, reinforced by a deep interest in the League, made him a valuable member of our Committee. His death is a serious public loss, and deprives us of an officer from whom we hoped for still greater services in the future. This is the first death among any of our members while in office. Three of our former officers, however, have died before 1890, but not until some time after the close of their official service. These were Dr. Woolsey, our first President, and Rev. Drs. Foote and Peirce, who had each served on the Executive Committee.

We also deeply regret the dangerous and prolonged illness of our President, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Paddock, but rejoice in the hopes we may now cherish of his ultimate recovery.

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING.

THE Eleventh Annual Meeting of the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE was held at 2.30 P. M., January 28, 1891, in the rooms of Hon. Edmund H. Bennett, LL. D., in the Hemenway Building, Boston. In the absence of Rev. B. H. Paddock, D. D., President, Rev. Alvah Hovey, D. D., first Vice-President, presided. Rev. W. H. Cobb offered prayer. The call of the meeting was read by the Secretary. The minutes of the last annual meeting were read and approved. The following persons were proposed by Rev. S. W. Dike, LL. D., and were elected members of the League:

Prof. Francis G. Peabody, Cambridge, Mass.

Hon. Charles C. Burr, Auburndale, Mass.

Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn.

Mr. William G. Benedict read his annual report as Treasurer. It was accepted, and referred to Mr. Hamilton A. Hill as Auditor. S. W. Dike, LL. D., Corresponding Secretary, read his annual report, which was accepted and referred to the Corresponding Secretary, the Chairman of the Executive Committee and the Treasurer for publication.

The following officers were elected:

President, Rt. Rev. B. H. Paddock, D. D.

Vice-President, Rev. Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D.; Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL. D.

Corresponding Secretary, Rev. S. W. Dike, LL. D.

Recording Secretary, Rev. C. H. Spalding.

Treasurer, William G. Benedict, Esq.

Executive Committee, Hon. Edmund H. Bennett, LL. D.; Pres. M. H. Buckham, D. D.; George C. Shattuck, M. D.; Prof. S. E. Baldwin; Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D. D.; Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph. D.; Prof. George Harris, D. D.; Prof. T. W. Dwight, LL. D.; Rev. James DeNormandie; Rev. G. D. B. Pepper, D. D., LL. D.; Hon. Hamilton A. Hill; Rev. S. W. Dike, LL. D.

After reading the minutes of the Secretary, the meeting adjourned:

C. H. SPALDING, *Recording Secretary*.

REPORT

OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

WE note the completion of the tenth year of our existence as a League. The preliminary organization of the League was made January 24, 1881, the day on which a lecture had been given by its present Secretary in the Boston Monday Lectureship on Facts as to Divorce in New England. That lecture used this specific subject to show that the Family is the real and inclusive problem before us; that this question confronts us and the civilized world; and that its solution is inseparably connected with that of the other great social problems of our times.

A little group of a dozen gentlemen met that day, effected a preliminary organization of the New England Divorce Reform League and adjourned to meet again the next month. It was nearly two years before public interest and our funds justified putting a Secretary into the field, and not until 1887 did our annual receipts rise above \$1,604. That year they were a little over \$2,500, and the past year they have reached \$2,926.63, being the largest in our history, meeting all dues and leaving \$16.84 in the treasury. In 1885, the Society became The National Divorce Reform League. It retained the substance of the original title for reasons that then were felt to be imperative. But the object of the League was more distinctly expressed in the new constitution, which reads: "*Its object shall be to promote an improvement in public sentiment and legislation in the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce.*"

From the first it has aimed to be Christian, catholic, and free from dogmatic utterances and from everything like shibboleths. It has sought to combine in wise proportions scientific and practical methods, and to be ready to move into its various fields as fast as fit opportunities and its slender means permitted.

It would be interesting if we could take the larger part of our report for a brief sketch of our work and its results in these ten years. This would lead us into the four departments we have opened. In

Investigation, we began on Divorce with the few tables which Dr. Woolsey, our first President, had given us, increased a little by those figures I had myself been able to collect, and with the registration reports of half a dozen States. We now have the large volume of the Department of Labor at Washington on Marriage and Divorce in the United States and Europe, of which Prof. Francis G. Peabody of Harvard says, after a year's use of it in his special courses, that it "makes the most important contribution to our social philosophy which this country has yet produced."

In *Legislation*, which necessarily waits on the education of public sentiment, good progress has been made. The tide of loose legislation has turned; the old notorious omnibus clauses have nearly disappeared from our statutes. Positive improvements have been made in both marriage and divorce laws in several States. Much more might have been done, but legislative reform was temporarily suspended to give opportunity for the larger information we needed, and now it again waits for the development of a promising plan for uniformity of action. For this year we note the inauguration under the lead of the great State of New York, of a movement for concurrent legislation, which may prove to be the beginning of one of the most important legislative experiments in our recent political history.

In *Education* the gain is still more important. Ten years ago there was no distinct study of the Family in our institutions of higher education. No books exclusively on this subject existed in the language. Only here and there a solitary review article could be found, though some work had been done in legislation and in two or three newspapers for three or four years. But within this time lectures have been introduced by us and others into the majority of all these institutions in the East and in many elsewhere. The study of Sociology and particularly of Social Structure and of the Family is rapidly extending. Scores of instructors of the highest grade have come to us for literature, references, suggestions, plans, or more direct aid. Many of the students of the earlier years of the period are now themselves teaching these subjects. Sociological Notes are now a distinct department in Reviews and other periodicals, and able writers have contributed to these publications and written books on our problems. Our work has tried to keep abreast of progress in sociological study, while it has led in some of its departments.

Practical work has also been done. Attention is turned to the evils of licentiousness, the criminal dearth of children, the use of the Home in the prevention of crime and intemperance, in the cure of poverty and in the solution of the problems of education in Church and School. The Home Department of the Sunday-school, for reaching homes outside the ordinary congregations and quickening the interest of the Family in its own work, is a recognized success. Surely these results are the proper occasion of devout gratitude and an incentive to continue the work now well begun. We can report, too, that in many directions, in these and other things, other persons and other societies, and also some of the great Christian bodies, have entered parts of the field, incited by our work, and also independently. We do this gratefully, though we may well believe that our League is the one special society that can most efficiently and economically grow into the field which it has done much to open and possess. Yet our best record is unwritten, in the change of the intellectual atmosphere and its better moral tone.

But our present work is too urgent to permit us to go into a review in anything like the degree needed to set forth the subject properly. We turn to the work of the year. Of our four departments, those of Legislation and Education have received the most attention in 1890.

INVESTIGATION.

The first edition of the Report on Marriage and Divorce by the Hon. Carroll D. Wright, U. S. Commissioner of Labor at Washington, is now exhausted, while large numbers of applications for it are on file at the Department. Provision for printing a second edition only waits the action of the House on the favorable report of its committee, having already passed the Senate.

The call of the Commissioner for means to print additional material to that already published, in connection with such as he thinks ought to be gathered immediately by further investigation, should be warmly supported by all good citizens who understand the need of thorough work. For this is one of those cases where matter already collected is made doubly valuable by the addition of other that is within reach of official inquiry. Prof. Peabody, in writing what I have already quoted, added, "What we need

in the social questions of the time is, first of all, a more comprehensive knowledge of the facts; and what we are misled by is a general notion of the situation, unverified by statistics. Mr. Charles Booth's book on East London represents the kind of survey on which all wise charity must rest. Col. Wright's Report, with its much wider range, covers with equal thoroughness its own part of the social question." Nothing more true can be said. For there are many points where popular opinion and even that of otherwise well informed persons is of doubtful value until verified by such investigation.

A common system for registration reports on Marriage and Divorce, such as a few States now have in considerable fulness, should be extended over all the country as rapidly as possible. Discussion will be fruitless and endless over such a point, for example, as the actual effect of restrictions upon the remarriage of the divorced, as it was regarding migration for divorce, until it was put under the light of statistics, unless we can tell how many divorced persons actually remarry. But let it be required by law that every application for a second marriage license shall set forth among its facts the date, place and cause of the dissolution of the former marriage or marriages, a comparatively easy thing to do, and every one can see the value of the knowledge we should gain, whether for legislation or social study. The check on bigamous marriages would be very great, especially if the more difficult practice for us of some European countries should be adopted, by which an entry of dissolution is always made on the original marriage record and thence certified on the following marriage license. But no new steps have been taken in this direction because the subject will probably come before the Commissions on Uniform Legislation.*

LEGISLATION.

The notorious cases in New York of Flack, Wentworth and certain Jewish parties, the latter condemned by most respectable

* I have, however, just received from Dr. C. A. Lindsay, the accomplished Secretary of the State Board of Health of Connecticut, the official report of the number of divorced persons married in that State in the year 1889. There were 286 such: 135 men and 151 women. This is about one-third the average number divorced annually eight or ten years before. Every one will see the value of such statistics. Yet this is the first ray of light the statistics of our States have shed on the point.

Hebrews, have justly called attention to legal defects which ought to be easily corrected. Private trials of divorce suits should, as a rule, be abolished. The statute of Illinois of 1887, forbidding the Divorce lawyer to advertise his business, would apparently be useful in New York and other States.

Our Report of last year said regarding Uniform Marriage and Divorce Legislation, "Our simple contention has been that the question could not be taken up seriously, with a view to positive advance towards its practical solution, until the country should be in possession of more accurately ascertained facts bearing upon it than those supplied by common observation." This position has been held by us for years. Indeed, no other has ever been taken in our annual reports. We have simply declined to oppose or to advocate national legislation under a constitutional amendment until we could get at the facts. The Report of Mr. Wright, with its demonstration that, notwithstanding the migratory character of our population, 80.1 per cent. of the divorces from American marriages of the entire country in twenty years occurred in the very States where the marriage had been celebrated, put the subject in a new light before the people. The popular pleas for constitutional amendment as a present and leading necessity have practically ceased.

UNIFORMITY BY CO-OPERATION OF STATES.

The popular demand for amendment and also attempts at reform in State Legislation have been temporarily suspended for another reason. The recommendation of the Governor of New York, in two annual messages, noted in our former reports, has been adopted. That leading State has now created by statute a "Commission for the Promotion of Uniform Legislation in the United States." The Commissioners are Henry R. Beekman, formerly Corporation Counsel for the City, William L. Snyder of New York, and Irving Browne of Albany, editor of the *Law Review*. Mr. Snyder is the author of several law books, one of which, "The Geography of Marriage," treats of the special problem of our conflicting laws. It was immediately felt on all sides that this practical opening should be carefully tried. Nothing could be more in consonance with our own general course than to co-operate in such a plan, which our own President Woolsey had been the first to sug-

gest many years ago, and which Governor Robinson of Massachusetts officially recommended in 1884.

Some will remember that the American Bar Association has had a Committee on Uniform Legislation for two years. I brought the work of the Association to the notice of the Commission, and by agreement we met the Committee in Saratoga in August. On looking into the subject, the Committee and the Association soon reached the conclusion that their common aim would be best advanced by heartily entering into the plan to get as many other States as possible, and also Congress in behalf of its own special jurisdiction, to establish Commissions on Uniformity of Legislation on the several subjects which either they or the State of New York had in contemplation, viz., Marriage and Divorce, Insolvency, the form of Notarial Certificates, Descent and Distribution of Property, Acknowledgment of Deeds, and Execution and Probate of Wills.

In a circular issued by the League September 10, announcing this result, we added, "It is thought that the work of this Commission and others that may join it, will be the best practicable preparation for this or any other solution of the problem of Uniformity. For this and other reasons, it deserves the hearty support of all who desire to see the evils of our conflicting laws reduced." Having been invited to write an article on Uniformity in the *Arena* for September, I took the opportunity to state the chief elements of the problem, and then added my own opinion in the following summary:

"It is contended, therefore, that all serious consideration of the problem should give careful attention to all the objects and effects of uniformity; that the place this particular problem holds in the present and future problem of Family law in this and other countries be understood; that the probable political consequences of any method of solution proposed be investigated; and that the conditions of the two leading methods commonly proposed are such that both their nature and the interests of all concerned require that the effort to examine the field of concurrent State legislation be made first, in order to discover what needs to be done, and what is practicable under the simpler political conditions to be met in this method. And now that the great State of New York has opened the way in this field of operations and invites the other States to co-operate, it would seem wise for all interested in Uniformity to help this method to accomplish all it may be capable of giving us. If Con-

gress could appoint Commissioners to represent its own direct interests in the subject, it might be well to have this done also. At any rate, in this way we are likely to get down to actual work on a problem that has hitherto been too much in the air."

In December Judge Bennett and myself, in behalf of our Executive Committee, addressed a letter to the Governors, and members of Legislatures in the interests of the general plan. The Commission of New York and the Committee of the Bar Association have done similar work. At this date it is too early to form an opinion of the result. But newspapers report already that the Governors of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Delaware and Pennsylvania, have officially commended the plan, and the subject is also before the Legislatures of a half-dozen or more other States in the East and West. It is everywhere highly approved. Several Governors have written of it most approvingly, and the prominent men who were asked to sign the petition for it, and the press unanimously commend the steps taken. The work contemplated can be well begun if only a few contiguous States enter upon its earlier stages. The difficulty of getting anything more before the present Congress has prevented much work for co-operation on its part.

At the request of one of the Commissioners, I sketched for use in their first meeting an outline of possible work, which was received most favorably. Some of the subjects for Uniformity in our field may be noted here in order to give the public some idea of the possibilities of the work. No estimate is made of the desirability or difficulties of the several particulars:

In marriage, we have such topics as the degrees of relationship within which marriage is forbidden; the grounds of void or voidable marriages; remarriage during the life of a former husband or wife; license, fees, and the registration of license; age of consent — parental and personal; form of celebration, returns of marriage, their record, publication, and the whole range of statistics both of marriage and divorce. In divorce, we may take up jurisdiction, legislative or judicial, including the class of courts and places and regulation of trials; the limitations of residence, now running all the way from ninety days in Dakota to five years in Massachusetts; methods and times of entering applications; restrictions upon hasty or secret trials; and upon advertising the procuring of divorces, now the law of Illinois; the statutory causes; provisions for defence of suits by the States, and against collusion, connivance, etc.; punish-

ment for the various offences leading to divorce; validity to be given to divorces obtained in defiance of the laws of domicile; and the possible adoption of some statute in the interests of comity, so that a State shall refuse to marry persons who cannot be married in the State of their proper residence; and for the collection and publication of statistics. Here surely is work enough. And it will occur to the thoughtful that this work may be so classed or divided that the uniformity may be secured in certain lines, while others are left untouched, either as comparatively needless, or in respect to the rights or cherished convictions of States. Grounds of divorce, for example, may be let alone for a time. Experimental legislation, if best, can be entered upon in a few States whose social and legal conditions are the most fit for improvement in law and for uniformity, leaving the others to profit by their experience. Or, all that is done both in study and in legislation, will be just so much gained towards uniformity under constitutional amendment, should that be finally desired. There does not seem to me the slightest justification for divergence among the friends of this reform into partisan contention over measures. The League has always stood for union on truly Christian and scientific methods in fidelity to the broad statement of its object already quoted from its Constitution.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE PROBLEMS.

We may, perhaps, repeat here a truth which we have always pointed out: that uniformity is not the centre of the legal problem any more than legislation is the leading part of the social problem of Marriage and Divorce. One great result of the government report has been to make this clear to others. The operation of the commissions will undoubtedly make it still more distinct. I would repeat the thought of last year, and which I urged in the *Arena*, on the likelihood that there are international interests which will call for the utmost breadth of view on the whole subject. If better theories of the Family and of Marriage and Divorce, or restatement in better form of the essentials of the commonly held doctrines are coming out of the seething life and thought of the future, we may well so adjust our work as to leave as little as possible to be undone. Our improved legislation ought not to be provincial farther than is necessary. If Europe is apparently working out a scientific system of Family Law, comparative study will be most

useful. This whole movement is still so much in its earlier stages, we really know so little of all the intricate social conditions that surround it and its subject, that reverent, careful study should temper our opinions and direct our course, while the terrible evils that confront us will not allow us to abate our zeal.

THE QUESTION IN JAPAN.

The state of the question in Japan is interesting at this point. In that country nearly all the regulations of Marriage and Divorce are still in the hands of the persons and families immediately concerned. That is to say: there is yet no system of public law regarding the Family like that which is the outgrowth of many centuries in the West. The civilization in Japan is, comparatively, far in advance of its development of Family Law. Japan is in the heat and ferment of political and social transition, while this fundamental social institution has small legal care, and divorces are one-third as numerous as marriages. A Japanese gentleman of high official position tells me that the leading statesmen of his country feel the gravity of the situation, and regard the construction of a system of public law for the Family as one of their early necessities. It seems to me that the ability, through sound education on the part of missionaries and other teachers, to aid other peoples in the development of a healthy Family — both in its structure and its legal surroundings, as well as in morals, — is one of the best contributions our Christian civilization can make to human progress. This is also true of work among the Indian and African races of our own country.

EDUCATION.

This last remark brings us to the Department of Education, for which more time has been found in 1890 than in the year before. Addresses have been made in churches and before clubs. One or two lectures in each institution have been given the past year in the theological seminaries of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Cambridge, New York, and Philadelphia; in those at Hartford and Princeton; in Wesleyan University at Middletown; the Colleges for Women at Wellesley and Bryn Mawr; in the University of Pennsylvania; and a course of seven lectures was given in the Lay College at Crescent Beach, near Boston. An address before the General Association of

Connecticut at New Haven was printed in full in the *Palladium*, and reprinted by the League. My article on Problems of the Family was published in the *Century* for January, 1890, being one of the Present Day papers of the Sociological Group. Besides the article in the *Arena* for September, 1890, on Uniform Marriage and Divorce laws, I contributed to the *Andover Review* of June a study in the Classification of Social Institutions, making special effort to determine the place of the Family in the social order. The year has been fruitful of articles by others on the Family in English and American Reviews.

An increase in special study of our subjects is evident in our Higher Educational Institutions. One gentleman who has been engaged in post-graduate study for several years, and who will doubtless soon hold an important position, is at work on a thesis on Divorce, which he began in Berlin. His work promises to be a positive contribution to our knowledge of the subject, and ought to be published.* Several professors have sought information and suggestions in the preparation of their courses in Sociology or Ethics. The correspondence which these and similar inquiries bring from teachers, students, writers, and pastors, has always made considerable addition to our work, yet apparently is most useful.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS: IN INSTITUTIONS.

But with all the remarkable progress of the last half dozen years in Sociological Education, there is need of doing much more. The work is too fragmentary and without full grasp of the field. Courses of study in Social Economics, in Domestic Economy, in Social Ethics, are too often offered and pursued without proper regard for their special place in a scientific whole. Provision should be made in time so that all who desire can take a systematic course of scientific study which should begin at the true beginning, which in my judgment is with the structure of society and the functions of its institutions as present facts; then treating the material historically and comparatively. Next comes the study of the Family, like histology or the study of tissue in other sciences. Then follows, and based upon the preceding, the study of the material and other elements which the Family takes on to make the Home. The more strictly sociological

* Since the above was in type, I learn that this important thesis will be published soon by Columbia College, New York.

study should thus be made the indispensable introduction to and preparation for the real knowledge of Social Economics, Domestic Economy, and Social Ethics, as it is of Political Economy and Political Science, not to mention Ecclesiology and Educational organizations. In other words, general Social Anatomy and general Social Physiology are the indispensable prerequisites to special studies, or else should come in at a very early stage in the work of social education. That is to say, a systematic course is needed for most students seeking a liberal education, which shall include Social Structure and the relation of the Family to it, not neglecting of course other institutions ; the Family in itself and in its membership, and its incidents of Marriage, Divorce, Sex, and Children; then its social, moral, and material development into the Home, including house building, sanitation, house-keeping, and so on ; the inter-relation of the Family and Home, and their relation to religious, educational, industrial, and political life, and to the development of the Sexes and the Individual. Different students would properly throw the weight of their effort on different parts of the work ; but certain parts, and especially the general survey of the field and its leading features and principles, should be held absolutely essential for all.

Most pastors, nearly all missionaries to foreign countries or the more primitive races in our own country, many legislators and editors, all social reformers, and most educated women should be fairly well equipped in the elements of this department of Sociology. Neither Psychology, Political Economy, nor Political Science is more needful to most of these classes.

I hold this discussion most pertinent in our Report. For it is vital to our reform, whose significance is appreciated best among those of highest sociological culture and those who have the quickest sense of social things. A good deal of special inquiry convinces me that not one pastor or foreign missionary in ten, unless it be among very young men, and few educated women beyond the younger graduates of college, are able to describe the social order of their fields of labor. Their work is thus often cramped or misdirected, like that of the uneducated man in the mechanical or chemical arts. Foreign missionaries especially suffer. As a rule, they have no education that enables them to bring to their work a quick insight into the social institutions of a people and their influence upon religious life. Some have shown remarkable results from natural aptitude, but the gain from good previous training would have been

very great. Considerable is being done already in some of the colleges for women. A scientific course on Domestic Economy is now offered at Wellesley, and perhaps in other institutions and in some cities. Social Economics and Social Ethics have for several years been taught in Andover and Harvard, and for a year or two at Hartford, and more or less in other theological seminaries. But these need in most cases to be greatly enlarged and to be properly placed in relation to Sociology, as I have already said.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE PEOPLE.

But what of the field outside College and Seminary? The Secretary of a State Missionary Society in New England recently told me he had been looking in vain so far for a woman educated sociologically to work in country towns. I know the rector of a "down-town" church in New York, whose house-to-house work has experienced new life in the hands of such a woman. The Toynbee Hall idea and its many allied possibilities, much practical work already going on, the building of improved dwellings demanding domestic education for their occupants, the whole vast work of helping the poor to better homes and better home life, and the increasing employment of women specially trained in Christian and philanthropic work—all call for helpers faster than the annual supply of the schools can produce them.

We need in this field immediately something like University extension. Courses of scientific and practical lectures on the topics already named should be given in all summer schools, and also in such other places that pastors in active service, women, and others interested in the Family and its problems can readily attend them. Every considerable city should have courses of this kind each year, while regular or occasional lectures ought to be given in the smaller centres. After a time educational institutes might be held in rural districts for the people generally, and these topics made prominent in them under skilful teachers. I have lately called the attention of those concerned in the reorganization of the University of Chicago to the need of both kinds of instruction, and am assured that the suggestions made are most welcome. They have also been favorably received in other similar quarters. I have come to think that a generous endowment of the League or one in some other special form—which should be free from all sectarian or other objectionable

limitations — that should provide for a systematic and efficient prosecution of such work, would prove one of the most useful expenditures that could be made of a hundred or of several hundred thousand dollars. The creation of such a true Home Missionary Institution would place some man or woman high among the honorable names of our public benefactors. How long shall we have to wait before this will be done?

But meanwhile Christians and Churches have a work to do. The relation of the Family to the Church and Society is such that it is entitled to a much larger place than it has had in the pulpit and other instruction of the Church, or in the prayer and thought and gifts of money of Christians. If we will take the Family with its outgrowth, the Home, and make this great fundamental and universal institution of human society the direct object of anything like the special study, inventive skill, and charitable expenditures for its special development that have been given to the local church, the school, or to temperance and other useful reforms, the results might be surprisingly great. The newspapers, in some of their excellent departments for the Home, are doing much. The Home Department of the Sunday School, which, as it came from me, was devised largely to give a practical example of what I thought is needed, and which has been taken up, and, with Dr. W. A. Duncan's earlier plan of Home Classes, as he called them, worked with great success by many pastors and some of the Sunday School societies, is accomplishing an educational mission in the possibilities of the Home. But the Home, — I now use the word comprehensively, — needs to be singled out as other social institutions have been, and to receive special study and special contributions of money and work. To do this, there must be either a society like our own, or special departments in the great benevolent societies of the Church. "I give to the League," said one of our earliest friends, "just as I give to Home Missions." Is it not a sound position to take that a *direct* gift of money to the interests of the Family should have a regular place beside that which one gives to Church support and extension, Ministerial Education, Sunday School work, and the many other objects of benevolence?

The protective and reformatory value of the Family is growing upon the public mind, but it needs to grow a great deal more. Irreligion, ignorance, poverty, and intemperance; lust and crime; base divorces and wretched marriages, and the greed of wealth, are

the social evils of our times. But nearly every one of them is peculiarly an evil of the Home. No small part of them really originate in the Home, whence they find their way into the saloon, the brothel, the almshouse, and the prison, every one of which institutions would shrink into small proportions if the conditions of Home and Family life were generally sound. For even organized vice can make small headway against wholesome domestic life. So, while we strike at evil institutions directly, we must also put forth corresponding effort to build strong Family life against them.

As we look to its needs and to the meagre sums given to the support of work for the Family, and the small effort yet made in its interests, we are oppressed. But as we look back over ten years, or a little more, and see what has been done, we are greatly encouraged. The times and their needs, the great and coming science of Sociology, and the larger thought and life of the Christian Church are working for us.

SAMUEL W. DIKE,

Corresponding Secretary.

TREASURER'S REPORT.

WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, *Treasurer*,

| DR. | In account with the National Divorce Reform League. | CR. |
|--|---|-----|
| 1890. | | |
| To Receipts for the year, being donations as per memo. at foot | \$2,926.63 | |
| | <hr/> | |
| | \$2,926.63 | |
| Dec. 31, 1890. To Balance . . | \$16.84 | |
| | <hr/> | |
| Jan. | | |
| 1 Col. Jacob L. Greene, Hartford, Conn. | \$25.00 | |
| 1 Prof. E. H. Griffin, D.D., LL.D., Baltimore . . | 5.00 | |
| 2 Rev. W. H. Moore, Hartford, Conn. | 5.00 | |
| 8 W. O. Grover, Boston, Mass. | 50.00 | |
| 14 Grace Church, Lawrence, Mass. | 12.83 | |
| 15 Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y. | 10.00 | |
| 16 Rev. P. D. Cowan, Wellesley, Mass. | 5.00 | |
| 20 Beneficent Church, Providence, R. I. | 25.00 | |
| 22 Prof. Alvah Hovey, D.D., LL.D., Newton Centre, Mass. | 5.00 | |
| 22 George C. Shattuck, M.D., Boston, Mass. . . | 25.00 | |
| 22 Rev. A. C. A. Hall, Boston, Mass. | 10.00 | |
| 28 Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H. | 10.00 | |
| 28 Prof. Henry E. Parker, D.D., Hanover, N. H. . | 5.00 | |
| 30 St. John's Church, Stamford, Ct. | 10.00 | |
| 30 Baptist Church, Newton Centre, Mass. | 10.00 | |
| 31 Pres. W. DeWitt Hyde, D.D., Brunswick, Me. . | 5.00 | |
| | <hr/> | |
| Received in January | \$217.83 | |
| | <hr/> | |
| Feb. | | |
| 5 Rt. Rev. B. H. Paddock, D.D., Boston, Mass. . | \$20.00 | |
| 7 St. Anne's Church, Lowell, Mass. | 25.00 | |
| 10 St. Thomas' Church, New York | 100.00 | |
| 11 Prof. Edward Conant, Randolph, Vt. | 10.00 | |

| | | | | |
|-------|----|---|--------|----------|
| Feb. | 11 | Hon. William E. Dodge, New York | | \$100.00 |
| | 17 | Rev. C. D. Bradlee, D.D., Boston, Mass. | | 5.00 |
| | 18 | Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D., Cambridge, Mass. | | 5.00 |
| | 18 | Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester, Mass. | | 10.00 |
| | | Received in February | | \$275.00 |
| March | 1 | Rev. Leroy S. Bean, So. Windham, Me. | | \$5.00 |
| | 1 | Joseph H. Gray, Boston, Mass. | | 10.00 |
| | 6 | Rev. William H. Cobb, Newton Centre, Mass. | | 5.00 |
| | 7 | Prof. Henry W. Farnham, New Haven, Ct. | | 50.00 |
| | 10 | William G. Benedict, Boston, Mass. | | 25.00 |
| | 11 | George W. Cable, Northampton, Mass. | | 5.00 |
| | 11 | Morris K. Jesup, New York | | 5.00 |
| | 12 | Mrs. Emily Appleton, Boston, Mass. | | 20.00 |
| | 12 | W. W. Lockwood, Detroit, Mich. | | 10.00 |
| | 12 | "A Stranger," New York | | 5.00 |
| | 14 | Rev. J. M. Stevenson, D.D., New York | | 5.00 |
| | 17 | First Baptist Church, Pawtucket, R. I. | | 10.00 |
| | 18 | Pres. James E. Rhoads, Bryn Mawr, Pa. | | 10.00 |
| | 18 | St. James' Church, Philadelphia | | 50.00 |
| | 18 | Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia | | 50.00 |
| | 19 | Alexander Brown, Philadelphia | | 25.00 |
| | 19 | William Goodell, M.D., Philadelphia | | 10.00 |
| | 20 | William S. Price, Philadelphia | | 5.00 |
| | 21 | B. F. Blake, Philadelphia | | 10.00 |
| | 21 | Park Congregational Church, Norwich, Conn. | | 25.00 |
| | 22 | Robert C. Ogden, Philadelphia | | 50.00 |
| | 22 | William C. Stroud, Philadelphia | | 10.00 |
| | 22 | George Burnham, Philadelphia | | 25.00 |
| | 23 | Prof. A. Sydney Biddle, Philadelphia | | 25.00 |
| | 23 | Charles E. Raulett, Auburndale, Mass. | | 5.00 |
| | 28 | Hon. N. Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Conn. | | 25.00 |
| | 28 | Prof. William Lawrence, Cambridge, Mass. | | 15.00 |
| | 28 | Anson Phelps Stokes, New York | | 10.00 |
| | | Received in March | | \$505.00 |
| April | 7 | Hon. Hamilton A. Hill, Boston, Mass. | | \$5.00 |
| | 7 | Hon. J. N. Denison, Boston, Mass. | | 20.00 |
| | 7 | Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls, New York | | 10.00 |
| | 17 | Hon. Edmund H. Bennett, LL.D., Boston, Mass. | | 10.00 |
| | 17 | George Knapp, Auburndale, Mass. | | 10.00 |
| | 18 | James C. Braman, Auburndale, Mass. | | 10.00 |
| | 19 | James J. Goodwin, New York | | 25.00 |
| | 23 | Grace Church, New York | | 100.00 |
| | 23 | Rev. Henry Fairbanks, Ph.D., St. Johnsbury, Vt. | | 20.00 |

| | | | |
|----------|---|--------|----------|
| April 23 | Hon. J. M. Allen, Hartford, Conn. | | \$20.00 |
| 23 | Prof. Graham Taylor, D.D., Hartford, Conn. | | 5.00 |
| 25 | Charles A. Jewell, Hartford, Conn. | | 10.00 |
| 26 | St. Paul's Church, Boston, Mass. | | 50.00 |
| | Received in April | | \$295.00 |
| May | 2 Hon. Jeremiah Halsey, Norwich, Conn. | | \$5.00 |
| 6 | Rev. Arthur Lawrence, Stockbridge, Mass. | | 25.00 |
| 7 | Gen. S. C. Armstrong, LL.D., Hampton, Va | | 10.00 |
| 7 | Trinity Church, Boston, Mass. | | 100.00 |
| 7 | Rev. H. G. Hoadley, N. Canaan, Ct. | | 5.00 |
| 8 | Rt. Rev. H. A. Neeley, D.D., Portland, Me. | | 5.00 |
| 10 | Pres. Seth Low, LL.D., New York (in part) | | 25.00 |
| 12 | Rev. Reese F. Alsop, D.D., Brooklyn, N.Y. | | 5.00 |
| 16 | Eugene Delano, Philadelphia | | 25.00 |
| 16 | Stuart Wood, Philadelphia | | 25.00 |
| 17 | W. W. Frazier, Philadelphia | | 25.00 |
| 20 | Nathan Mosman, Auburndale, Mass. | | 1.00 |
| 27 | Samuel D. Warren, Boston, Mass. | | 15.00 |
| 28 | Hon. Dorman B. Eaton, New York | | 20.00 |
| | Received in May | | \$291.00 |
| June | 2 J. B. Goodrich, Newton, Mass. | | \$5.00 |
| 4 | A. A. Low, Brooklyn, N. Y. | | 25.00 |
| 9 | Charles E. Eddy, Newton, Mass. | | 2.00 |
| 14 | J. Howard Nichols, Newton, Mass. | | 5.00 |
| 14 | Hon. C. C. Burr, Auburndale, Mass. | | 10.00 |
| 21 | Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C. | | 5.00 |
| 28 | Dr. Charles A. Peabody, Worcester, Mass. | | 10.00 |
| | Received in June | | \$62.00 |
| July | 7 Hon. S. B. Capen, Boston, Mass. | | \$10.00 |
| 7 | George Ripley, Andover, Mass. | | 10.00 |
| 8 | Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale, Mass. | | 5.00 |
| 14 | Edwin Ginn, Winchester, Mass. | | 5.00 |
| 15 | Rev. Joseph Cook, Ticonderoga, N. Y. | | 10.00 |
| 18 | Hon. Robbins Battell, Norfolk, Conn. | | 10.00 |
| 18 | Ephraim Whitman, Worcester, Mass. | | 25.00 |
| | Received in July | | \$75.00 |
| Aug. | 4 Rev. F. H. Johnson, Andover, Mass. | | \$10.00 |
| Sept. | 11 Samuel Johnson, Boston, Mass. | | \$10.00 |
| | 16 Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester, Mass. | | 25.00 |

| | | | |
|-------|----|---|----------|
| Sept. | 18 | J. W. Danielson, Providence, R. I. | \$20.00 |
| | 30 | Prof. L. O. Brastow, D.D., New Haven, Conn. | 10.00 |
| | 30 | Harvard Congregational Church, Brookline, Mass. | 28.43 |
| | | Received in September | \$93.43 |
| Oct. | 6 | St. Paul's Church, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia | \$25.00 |
| | 6 | John G. Cary, Roxbury, Mass. | 10.00 |
| | 6 | Pres. Seth Low, LL.D., New York (balance of contribution) | 25.00 |
| | 10 | George P. Davis, Newton Centre, Mass. | 5.00 |
| | 11 | Prof. C. W. Shields, D.D., LL.D., Princeton, N. J. | 10.00 |
| | 14 | Rev. C. W. Huntington, Lowell, Mass. | 5.00 |
| | 14 | E. R. Brown, Dover, N. H. | 5.00 |
| | 15 | Grace Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. | 25.00 |
| | 17 | St. Paul's Church, Pawtucket, R. I. | 10.00 |
| | 21 | Church of the Incarnation, New York | 50.00 |
| | 21 | Frederick D. Allen, Boston, Mass. | 10.00 |
| | 28 | Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown, Mass. | 10.00 |
| | 30 | Hon. R. D. Benedict, Brooklyn, N. Y. | 20.00 |
| | 31 | Rev. E. W. Donald, D.D., New York | 10.00 |
| | 31 | Pilgrim Congregational Church, Nashua, N. H. | 11.37 |
| | | Received in October | \$231.37 |
| Nov. | 1 | Hon. B. Douglas, Middletown, Ct. | \$10.00 |
| | 1 | First Congregational Church, Middletown, Ct. | 10.00 |
| | 3 | Rev. D. L. Furber, Newton Centre, Mass. | 2.00 |
| | 6 | Rev. E. K. Alden, D.D., Boston, Mass. | 10.00 |
| | 12 | Payson Church, Portland, Me. | 20.00 |
| | 13 | Prof. T. W. Dwight, LL.D., New York | 25.00 |
| | 13 | Henry G. Marquand, New York | 20.00 |
| | 14 | E. P. Dutton, New York | 10.00 |
| | 16 | First Church, Nashua, N. H. | 15.00 |
| | 19 | Rev. E. A. Hoffman, D.D., New York | 25.00 |
| | 20 | Rev. G. S. Dickerman, Amherst, Mass. | 3.00 |
| | 24 | Henry O. Houghton, Cambridge, Mass. | 10.00 |
| | 25 | St. Bartholomew's Church, New York | 100.00 |
| | 25 | Phillips Church, So. Boston, Mass. | 3.00 |
| | 28 | Rev. Augustus Woodbury, D.D., Providence, R. I. | 5.00 |
| | 29 | Prof. Simon E. Baldwin, New Haven, Ct. | 50.00 |
| | 29 | Joseph Story Fay, Boston, Mass. | 20.00 |
| | | Received in November | \$338.00 |
| Dec. | 3 | Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, New York | \$20.00 |
| | 4 | Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I. | 10.00 |
| | 6 | Rev. T. T. Munger, D.D., New Haven, Conn. | 5.00 |

| | | |
|--------|--|------------|
| Dec. 6 | W. W. Brown, Portland, Me. | 10.00 |
| 8 | St. Luke's Church, Philadelphia | 25.00 |
| 8 | Joseph Lippitt, Providence, R. I. | 5.00 |
| 9 | A Lady, Vermont | 20.00 |
| 9 | Hon. Felix R. Brunot, Allegheny, Pa. | 25.00 |
| 10 | St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I. | 10.00 |
| 10 | Dr. Charles W. Parsons, Providence, R. I. | 2.00 |
| 11 | Congregational Church, Thompson, Conn. | 6.00 |
| 13 | William F. Whittmore, Boston, Mass. | 10.00 |
| 13 | First Church, Hartford, Conn. | 25.00 |
| 16 | Rev. C. Cutler, Auburndale, Mass. | 3.00 |
| 18 | Rev. W. M. Taylor, D.D., LL D., New York | 20 00 |
| 19 | John Nicholas Brown, Providence, R. I. | 25.00 |
| 20 | St. John's Church, Providence, R. I. | 25.00 |
| 20 | Central Congregational Church, Providence, R. I. | 25.00 |
| 23 | Hon. Henry C. Robinson, Hartford, Ct. | 5.00 |
| 23 | Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale, Mass. | 5.00 |
| 24 | St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia | 100.00 |
| 25 | Prof. W. E. Huntington, Ph.D., Newton Centre, Mass. | 5.00 |
| 26 | G. Henry Whitecomb, Worcester, Mass. | 25.00 |
| 26 | Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale, Mass. | 2.00 |
| 31 | Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale, Mass. | 10.00 |
| 31 | C. S. Roberts, Auburndale, Mass. | 20.00 |
| 31 | Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., D.C.L., New York | 25.00 |
| 31 | North Avenue Congregational Church, Cambridge, Mass. | 20.00 |
| 31 | Congregational Church, Hyde Park, Mass. | 10.00 |
| 31 | Mrs. Horace Fairbanks, St. Johnsbury, Vt. | 10.00 |
| 31 | State St. Cong'l Church, Portland, Maine | 25.00 |
| | Received in December | \$533.00 |
| | Total receipts in 1890 | \$2,926.63 |

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National Divorce Reform League.

ARTICLE I. This Association shall be called the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE.

ART. II. Its object shall be to promote an improvement in public sentiment and legislation in the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number.

ART. IV. The Officers of this Society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which Committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices; to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its Annual Meeting on the first Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the Committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two-thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL. D., Auburndale, Mass.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE, a Corporation created by the laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successors or assigns, the sum of dollars, the principal [or income as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.

